

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
FORT WAYNE DIVISION**

MITCH TAEBEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Cause No. 1:24-CV-288 HAB-SLC
)	
FRIENDS OF PRENTICE)	
)	
Defendant)	

MITCH TAEBEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Cause No. 1:24-CV-303 HAB-SLC
)	
THE JEWISH MUSEUM)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING CASES
AND IMPOSING SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF**

Before the Court are Taebel’s two latest frivolous and nonsensical lawsuits. On July 9, 2024, the Court warned Taebel to cease filing frivolous lawsuits lest he face monetary sanctions and restrictions on his ability to make further filings in this district. *Taebel v. Instagram* and *YOUTUBE*, Cause Nos. 2:24-CV-226-PPS-AZ and 2:24-CV232-PPS-APR, Dismissal and Warning Order, ECF No. 2. That Order outlined a series of ten meritless lawsuits previously filed by Taebel since July 2023.¹ That is to say nothing of the nearly half-dozen cases he filed in this

¹ See *Taebel v. Swift*, Cause No. 2:23-CV-258-HAB-SLC (closed Sept. 13, 2023); *Taebel v. Field*, Cause No. 2:24-CV-038-JVB-JEM (closed Mar. 12, 2024); *Taebel v. Flynn*, Cause No. 2:24-CV-049-JVB-APR (closed April 23, 2024); *Taebel v. Indiana*, 2:24- CV-127-PPS-APR (closed Apr. 23, 2024); *Taebel v. Link*, 2:24-CV-124-PPS-APR (closed Apr. 29, 2024); *Taebel v. Biden*, Cause No. 2:24-CV-066-JTM-JEM (closed May 2, 2024); *Taebel v. Swift*, Cause No. 2:24-CV-073-JTM-JEM (closed July 1, 2024); *Taebel v. NFL*, Cause No. 3:24-CV-390-CCB-MGG (filed May 16, 2024).

court before July 2023. See *Taebel v. Criminal Statutes Against Cannabis*, Case No. 3:18-CV-14-PPS-MGG (closed April 3, 2018); *Taebel v. Harder*, 3:18-CV-268-JD-MGG (closed April 17, 2018); *Taebel v. US DOJ*, 1:18-CV-329-WCL-PRC (closed Nov. 27, 2018); *Taebel v. Department of Justice*, 1:18-CV-330-TLS-SLC (closed December 3, 2018) and the myriad cases he has filed in the Arizona District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Central and Southern Districts of California, the Court of Federal Claims, Western District of Virginia, the Middle District of Tennessee, and others. A generalized PACER search shows over 60 cases Taebel filed in various courts over the years.² Essentially, Taebel is a professional filer and an abuser of the Court process.

Despite the Court's warnings, Taebel doubled down by filing the two present lawsuits – both of which are patently frivolous and full of outlandish assertions. The Court possesses “ample authority to dismiss frivolous or transparently defective suits spontaneously, and thus save everyone time and legal expense.” *Hoskins v. Poelstra*, 320 F.3d 761, 763 (7th Cir. 2003). This is true even acknowledging that pro se pleadings are held to less stringent standards than those drafted by lawyers. See *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992). Accordingly, these two newest cases are DISMISSED with PREJUDICE.

But enough is enough. District courts have the authority to impose sanctions on litigants who file frivolous cases and motions, which burden the Court and the defendants named in those suits. Sanctions are a last resort and, as a general rule, this Court is reluctant to impose them. But there are instances, and this is certainly one of them, when sanctions are necessary. As this Court explained in another case:

² The Court has not conducted a detailed review of the dockets in all 60 cases shown in PACER. From the ones it did review, there appear to be a few cases were spawned by events occurring while he was in custody in his criminal cases. These were dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee or request *in forma pauperis* status. However, the lion's share of cases are similar in ilk to the ones filed in this Court.

Something must be done, because the Plaintiff's conduct is wasting limited judicial resources. "Abusers of the judicial process are not entitled to sue and appeal without paying the normal filing fee—indeed, are not entitled to sue and appeal, period. Abuses of process are not merely not to be subsidized; they are to be sanctioned." *Free v. United States*, 879 F.2d 1535, 1536 (7th Cir. 1989). "Federal courts have both the inherent power and constitutional obligation to protect their jurisdiction from conduct which impairs their ability to carry out Article III functions." *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 185 n.8 (1989) (quoting *In re Martin-Trigona*, 737 F.2d 1254, 1261 (2nd Cir. 1984)). A district judge has the power to enjoin frequent litigators from the continued filing of frivolous suits and motions. *In re Chapman*, 328 F.3d 903, 905–06 (7th Cir. 2003).

Holland v. Lake Cnty. Mun. Gov't, No. 2:13-CV-179-TLS, 2016 WL 10599511, at *1 (N.D. Ind. Dec. 5, 2016).

For these reasons, TAEBEL is HEREBY SANCTIONED for repeatedly filing frivolous and vexatious lawsuits in this Court. The Court, therefore:

- (1) **DISMISSES** Cause Nos. 1:24-CV-288 HAB-SLC and 1:24-CV-303 HAB-SLC **WITH PREJUDICE**;
- (2) **FINES** Plaintiff Mitch Taebel \$1,000.00 in each of the above cause numbers;
- (3) **IMPOSES a DISTRICT-WIDE FILING RESTRICTION** prohibiting the Plaintiff from filing new civil cases in any court in the Northern District of Indiana or filing papers in any of his closed cases until he pays the fines.
- (4) **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to return, unfiled, any attempts to file new cases, or papers in closed civil cases, by or on behalf of Plaintiff (except for a notice of appeal) until the fines are resolved. The CLERK is further directed to notify the Chief Judge of any attempted filings in violation of this ORDER.
- (5) **ADMONISHES** the Plaintiff that attempts to file papers without first paying the fines may result in additional fines as sanctions for violating this Court's Order.

The **CLERK OF COURT** is **INSTRUCTED** to distribute a copy of this Opinion and Order to all the Judges and Magistrate Judges in this District.

SO ORDERED on July 25, 2024.

s/ Holly A. Brady

CHIEF JUDGE HOLLY A. BRADY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT